

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 469 of 2000

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed : NO
to see the judgements?

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy : NO
of the judgement?

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question : NO
of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

BHIKHABHAI BALKISHAN SHAH

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Appearance:

MS DR KACHHAVAH for Petitioner
MR KT DAVE AGP for Respondent No. 1, 2, 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

Date of decision: 13/03/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT

#. The petitioner has been detained under the provisions
of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act,
1985 ("PASA Act" for short) by virtue of an order passed
by Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad City, Ahmedabad, in
exercise of powers under Section 3(2) of the PASA Act,

dated July 7, 1999.

#. The grounds of detention indicate that the detaining authority took into consideration two offences registered against the petitioner with Bapunagar Police Station, under the Bombay Prohibition Act. The detaining authority also took into consideration the statements of two anonymous witnesses in respect of two incidents that occurred on June 15, 1999 and June 20, 1999 and came to conclusion that the petitioner is a bootlegger, that his activities are detrimental to public order, that fear expressed by the witnesses qua the petitioner was genuine and therefore, powers under section 9(2) of the PASA Act were exercised by the detaining authority by not disclosing identity of these witnesses.

#. The petitioner has challenged this order of detention on various counts. However, learned advocate, Ms. Kachchhwah has restricted her arguments to the fact that the subjective satisfaction recorded by the detaining authority for the need for exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act, cannot be considered as genuine. In order to substantiate his submission, Ms. Kachchhwah submitted that the statements of two anonymous witnesses were recorded on July 7, 1999 which were verified by the detaining authority on the same day i.e. on 7th July, 1999 and the order of detention is also passed on 7th July, 1999. She submitted, therefore, that there was no time for the detaining authority to give consideration to the aspect of correctness and genuineness of the facts stated by the witnesses and the fear expressed by the witnesses, respectively, in their statements. The exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act is improper and has resulted into denial of right of making an effective representation as contemplated under Article 22 (5) of the Constitution. Mr. Raval therefore, submitted that, in light of the decision of a Division Bench of this Court in the case of Kalidas Chandubhai Kahar v. State of Gujarat & Ors. 1993 (2) GLR 1659, this petition may be allowed.

#. Mr. K.T.Dave, learned Assistant Government Pleader, has opposed this petition. He, however, does not dispute the factual aspect of the verification of the statements having been made on 7th July, 1999 and the order having been passed on the same day i.e. on 7th July, 1999.

#. Affidavit-in-reply has not been filed by the detaining authority and no explanation is forthcoming as to what material was considered by the detaining

authority for arriving at a conclusion that the fear expressed by the witnesses qua the petitioner is genuine or whether there was any contemporaneous material available with the detaining authority or not. No details are given by detaining authority as to at point of time, the statements were recorded, the proposal made by the sponsoring authority, witnesses called by the detaining authority for verification, verification done and the order prepared and signed on 7th July, 1999.

#. It is clear from the grounds of detention that the detaining authority has taken into consideration the statements of two anonymous witnesses. The authority came to a conclusion that the fear expressed by these witnesses is correct and genuine and, therefore, the authority exercised powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act by not disclosing the identity of the witnesses. This Court is at loss to appreciate how the detaining authority could have arrived at this conclusion in such short spell.

#. Similar such situation arose before a Division Bench of this Court in the case of Kalidas Chandubhai Kahar (supra), where the statements were verified on 16th October, 1992 and the order was passed on 17th October, 1992 and the Division Bench said that exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act was improper. This improper exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act was held to be detrimental to the right of the detenu of making an effective representation contemplated under Article 22(5) of the Constitution. The order of detention was, therefore, quashed. The facts of the present case squarely fall in line with the facts of that case. The order of detention, therefore stands vitiated in the instant case as well and the petition deserves to be allowed on this count alone.

#. In view of the above discussion, the petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated July 7, 1999 passed against the detenu Bhikhabhai Balkishan Shah, is hereby quashed. The detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other matter. Rule is made absolute with no orders as to costs.

[A.L.DAVE, J.]

pirzada/